



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/960,528	09/24/2001	Hiroshi Sumiyama	325772026900	5299
25227	7590	05/10/2007	EXAMINER	
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP			QIN, YIXING	
1650 TYSONS BOULEVARD			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 400			2625	
MCLEAN, VA 22102				

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/10/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/960,528	SUMIYAMA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Yixing Qin	2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 December 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 24 September 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

In response to applicant's amendment received 12/11/06, all requested changes have been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, filed 12/11/06 with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of the previously cited Fischer reference and a new reference Takise et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,353,222)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

I. Claims 1-5 and 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fischer (U.S. Patent No. 6,762,852) in view of Takise (U.S. Patent No. 5,353,222)

Regarding claims 1, 8 and 10, Fischer discloses an image processing apparatus that is connected to a plurality of printers through a network and that transmits a print job including image data to any of the printers, the image processing apparatus comprising:

a memory that stores paper sizes available in each printer connected to the network such that paper size information is associated to each printer; (Fig. 2)

The Fischer reference discloses a method of printing a document using the best available printer using criteria such as size (column 4, lines 48-56), but not multiple image size information.

Thus, it does not explicitly disclose “an obtaining unit that obtains multiple image size information regarding a print job;

a comparator that compares all of the image sizes in the print job with the paper sizes available in each printer to determine which-single printer is most compatible with the entire print job;”

However, Takise discloses in Fig. 3 various page formats. Column 6, lines 6-14 discloses the usage of a printer capable of printing multiple sizes.

Fischer and Takise are combinable because both are in the art of printing a document in using an optimal printer.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used a printing machine like that of Takise in Fischer's network to enable users to print jobs with different sized pages.

The motivation would have been to allow a user more customization when printing a particular document.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Fischer and Takise to obtain the invention as specified.

Fischer also discloses a selector that selects a printer to which the print job is sent based on the comparison results obtained by the comparator; (Fig. 3, S5, S6, S8) and a transmitter that transmits the print job to the selected printer selected by the selector. (Fig. 3, S9, S10)

Regarding claim 2, Fischer discloses wherein the selector selects a printer that has all of the paper sizes that match the image sizes. (Fig. 3, S5, S6) Again, from claim 1 above, the Takise reference addressed the idea of having multiple page sizes in a print job.

Regarding claims 3, 9 and 11, Fischer discloses wherein the selector selects a printer that has the most paper sizes that match the image sizes. (Fig. 3, S5, S6, column 4, lines 57-60). Again, from claim 1 above, the Takise reference addressed the idea of having multiple page sizes in a print job.

Regarding claim 4, the secondary reference, Takise discloses “where none of the printers has all of the paper sizes that match the image sizes, the selector selects a printer that has a paper

supply device through which paper of additional sizes may be inserted in the printer.” (column 6, lines 6-34).

Regarding claim 5, Fischer and Takise suggest “notification means that notifies an user of that size of paper that is inserted in the paper supply device when the paper supply device is selected..” (Fischer discloses notification means to an user of features of printers in S8 of Fig. 3. Takise, as mentioned above, discloses a laser printer capable of different printing using different sized papers. Thus, it would have been obvious to simply display a notification of paper in a paper supply since that would be a feature of the printer of Takise.)

Regarding claim 6, the Takise reference suggest “wherein said device has notification means that notifies the user of all of the image sizes.” (Fig. 3 discloses the format information of each page stored in memory. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill how to display these if it would be helpful to the user)

II. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fischer (U.S. Patent No. 6,762,852) in view of Takise (U.S. Patent No. 5,353,222) and further in view of Shima (U.S. Patent No. 6,369,909).

The Fischer reference discloses a method of printing a document using the best available printer using criteria such as size (column 4, lines 48-56), but not multiple image size information.

It does not explicitly disclose "wherein data is communicated between the printers in order to store in the memory the information regarding the paper sizes available in each printer."

However, Shima discloses in the abstract that a printer can obtain performance attributes of other printers and relay it to a host. Fig. 13 and column 23, lines 58-67 and column 14, lines 1-13 discusses these attributes, one of which is paper size.

All references are combinable because both are in the art of using an optimal printer to print a document based upon document attributes.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have enabled printers in Fischer to communicate to each other.

The motivation would be to reduce the amount of work on a print server if one printer were able to gather information about other printers on the network and relay the attribute information of all the printers to a print server without necessarily having the print server querying all the printers for attribute information.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine all references to obtain the invention as specified.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yixing Qin whose telephone number is (571)272-7381. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Twyler Lamb can be reached on (571)272-7406. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



TWYLER LAMB
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER